**Supplemental Table 1: Estimated risk of bias by scoring a list of items related to the reporting and methodological quality of the included systematic reviews on the treatment of Early Childhood Caries with Silver-fluoride-products**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality criteria \*** | **Duangthip et al. (2015)** | **Gao et al. (2016)** | **Contreras et al. (2017)** | **Chibinski et al. (2017)** | **Oliveira et al. (2019)** |
| 1) Defined outcome criteria of interest | + | + | + | + | + |
| 2) Describes the rationale | + | + | + | + | + |
| 3) Describes the focused (PICO)[S] question / hypothesis | + | + | + | + | + |
| 4) Describes if a protocol was developed ‘a priori’ | + | + | + | + | + |
| 5) Protocol registration/publication | - | - | - | + | + |
| 6) Presented eligibility criteria (in/exclusion criteria) | + | + | + | + | + |
| 7) Presents the full search strategy | + | + | + | + | + |
| 8) Various databases searched | + | + | + | + | + |
| 9) Performed (hand) search in additional sources (i.e. grey literature or trial) | - | + | - | + | + |
| 10) Review selection by more than 1 reviewer | + | + | + | + | + |
| 11) Non-English papersincluded | - | + | - | + | + |
| 12) Provide details on the performed study selection process/ flow chart | + | + | + | + | + |
| 13) Report included study characteristics | + | + | + | + | + |
| 14) Provide data of the selected studies on the outcome measures of interest | + | + | + | + | + |
| 15) Data were extracted by more than reviewer | + | + | + | + | + |
| 16) Contacted authors for additional information | - | - | - | + | + |
| 17) Report heterogeneity of the included studies | + | + | - | + | + |
| 18) Estimated risk of bias in individual studies | + | + | - | + | + |
| 19) Performed a meta-analysis | - | + | - | + | + |
| 20) Performed a descriptive analysis | + | + | + | + | + |
| 21) Describe additional sub analysis | + | + | - | + | + |
| 22) Grading of the obtained evidence | + | + | - | + | + |
| 23) Present limitations of the systematic review | + | + | + | + | + |
| 24) Provide a conclusion that respond to the objective | + | + | + | + | + |
| 25) Publication bias assessed | + | + | + | + | + |
| 26) Funding source | + | + | + | + | + |
| 27) Conflict of interest statement | + | + | + | + | + |
| **Original Review authors estimated level of evidence** | **Not reported** | **Not reported** | **Not reported** | **High** | **High** |
| Synopsis authors estimated quality score | 22  81% | 25  92% | 18  66% | 27  100% | 27  100% |
| Synopsis authors estimated risk of bias | **moderate** | **Low** | **moderate** | **low** | **low** |

\*Each aspect of the reporting and methodological quality item score list was given a rating of a plus “+” for informative description of the item at issue and a study design meeting the quality standard was assigned, plus-minus (") was assigned if the item was incompletely described, and minus “!” was used if the item was not described at all []. NA = not applicable. For the quality assessment score individual items with a positive rating were summed to obtain an overall percentage score.

**Supplemental Table 2**: **Quality Assessment with the Newcastle–Ottawa scale (NOS) for studies selected in the part of NOCM of ECC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Selection**  **(max 4 stars)** | **Comparability**  **(max 2 stars)** | **Outcome**  **(max 3 stars)** |
| Gao et al., 2016 | \*\*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Autio-Gold and Courts, 2001 | \*\*\*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Sitthisettapong et al., 2012 | \*\*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Divaris et al., 2013 | \*\*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Itaborahy et al., 2015 | \*\* | - | \*\* |
| Memarpour et al., 2015 | \*\*\*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Lo et al., 1998 | \*\*\*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Peretz et al., 2006 | \*\*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Duangthip et al., 2018 | \*\*\*\* | \*\* | \*\*\* |
| Chu et al., 2002 | \*\*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |

Each star refers to a positive answer in the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Form.

Thresholds for converting the Newcastle-Ottawa scales to AHRQ standards:

**Good quality:** 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

**Fair quality:** 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

**Poor quality:** 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain

**Supplemental Table 3**: **Quality Assessment with the Newcastle–Ottawa scale (NOS) for studies selected in the part of restorative options of ECC**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Selection**  **(max 4 stars)** | **Comparability**  **(max 2 stars)** | **Outcome**  **(max 3 stars)** |
| Eshghi et al., 2013 | \*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Sawant et al., 2017 | \*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Arrow et al., 2016 | \*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Walia et al., 2014 | \*\*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Trairatvorakul et al., 2004 | \* | \* | \*\* |
| Amin et al., 2016 | \*\* | \* | \*\* |
| Buecher et al., 2013 | \*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Ram et al., 2006 | \*\*\* | \*\* | \*\* |

Each star refers to a positive answer in the Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Form

Thresholds for converting the Newcastle-Ottawa scales to AHRQ standards:

**Good quality:** 3 or 4 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

**Fair quality:** 2 stars in selection domain AND 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain AND 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain

**Poor quality:** 0 or 1 star in selection domain OR 0 stars in comparability domain OR 0 or 1 stars in outcome/exposure domain